

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicants note that a number of editorial amendments have been made to the specification and abstract for grammatical and general readability purposes. No new matter has been added.

Applicants thank the Examiner for returning the PTO-1449 form submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on April 15, 2003. However, Applicants note that the Examiner did not initial next to the single U.S. patent listed on the PTO-1449 form. Accordingly, Applicants are enclosing a copy of the above mentioned PTO-1449 form. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the U.S. reference listed on the PTO-1449 form and return the initialed and signed form with the next Office paper.

I. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. (U.S. 6,336,124) in view of Makipaa et al (U.S. 6,556,217).

Claim 1, as amended, sets forth a display device for displaying information specified in a document description language for a structured document, the display device comprising a layout rule change part containing a plurality of predetermined layout rules applicable to the document description language, the layout rule change part being operable to select one of the layout rules. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious at least this feature of claim 1.

The Examiner recognizes that Alam does not disclose or suggest a layout rule change part (see Office Action at page 3). The Examiner, however, applies Makipaa and asserts that

Makipaa discloses a layout rule change part that is able to select one of a plurality of layout rules.

In particular, Applicants note that Makipaa discloses a method for displaying information which identifies a user terminal type and a screen size of the user terminal upon a logon of the user terminal (see col. 3, lines 16-18). Layout rules and typographical settings are then extracted based on this identified information (see col. 3, lines 18-19). Thereafter, resizing of the data can be performed such that the data is able to fit on the screen of the user terminal (see col. 3, lines 24-28).

Thus, in Makipaa, the selection of a particular layout rule is based solely on a user terminal type and screen size. Claim 1, however, has been amended to recite that the layout rule change part contains a plurality of predetermined layout rules applicable to the document description language of the information to be displayed. Applicants respectfully submit that Makipaa fails to disclose or suggest such a feature.

In particular, Applicants submit that while Makipaa provides a plurality of layout rules applicable to the type of user terminal on which information is to be displayed, Makipaa does not provide a plurality of layout rules applicable to the document description language of the information to be displayed. By utilizing layout rules that are applicable to the document description language, the layout rules can be provided independent of the type of user terminal device on which the information is to be displayed.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is respectfully requested. Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

In addition, claim 9 has been amended to recite the feature of a user input process rule change part containing a plurality of predetermined user input process rules applicable to user input, the user input process rule change part being operable to select one of the plurality of user input process rules. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature.

The Examiner recognizes that Alam does not disclose or suggest a user input process rule change part. The Examiner, however, alleges that Makipaa discloses a user input process rule change part at col. 9, line 8 through col. 10, line 36 (see Office Action at page 7). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The section of Makipaa cited by the Examiner describes layout rules for the display, such as the number of columns to use, spacing between paragraphs, and resizing of the information (see col. 9, lines 34-37 and 50-66), but does not describe user input process rules, as specifically recited in claim 9. By providing the ability to select one of a plurality of user input process rules, the effect that a particular user input will have on the information displayed on the screen can be changed.

Moreover, as noted above, claim 9 has been amended to clarify that the user input process rule change part contains a plurality of predetermined user input process rules applicable to the user input. In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 9 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 10, Applicants note that this claim recites that the rule change instruction part instructs, at the same time, the layout rule change part for the change of the layout rules, and the user input process rule change part for the change of the user input process

rules. As noted above with respect to claim 9, Makipaa fails to disclose or suggest user input process rules, but instead, merely discloses layout rules.

Further, Applicants note that claim 10 calls for the rule change instruction part to instruct both the layout rule change part and the user input process rule change part at the same time. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Alam and Makipaa fails to teach or even suggest such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 10 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is respectfully requested.

Claim 11, as amended, recites the feature of a user input process rule change part containing a plurality of user input process rules applicable to the user input. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious at least this feature of claim 11.

In the rejection of claim 11, the Examiner has not specifically addressed the feature regarding user input process rules, but instead, has addressed the feature of layout rules. Applicants respectfully submit that the layout rules of Makipaa do not correspond to user input process rules. Nonetheless, Applicants have amended claim 11 by clarifying that the user input process rule change part contains a plurality of user input process rules applicable to the user input. As noted above with respect to claim 9, the combination of Alam and Makipaa fails to disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious such a feature.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is respectfully requested. Claims 12-17 depend from claim 11 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kiyoshi OGISHI et al.

By: Kenneth Fields
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/gtg
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 8, 2004